



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,494	12/12/2003	Michael J. Muller	IBM-003	1618
51835	7590	10/26/2007	EXAMINER	
IBM LOTUS & RATIONAL SW			KHANNA, MADHU	
c/o GUERIN & RODRIGUEZ				
5 MOUNT ROYAL AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MOUNT ROYAL OFFICE PARK				
MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752			4117	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/734,494	MULLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Madhu Khanna	4117	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/12/2003</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

Art Unit: 4117

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. Claims 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 which reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

In this case, computer-related inventions whether descriptive or functionally descriptive material are non-statutory categories when claimed as descriptive material *per se* (see *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360 USPQ2d at 1759), falling under the "process" category (i.e. inventions that consist of a series of steps or acts to be performed). See 35 U.S.C. 100(b) ("The term process means, art, or method, and includes a new use of a known process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter or material"). Functional descriptive material: "data structures" representing descriptive material *per se* or computer program representing computer listing *per se* (i.e. software *per se*) when embodied in a computer-readable media are still not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. However, a claimed computer-readable storage medium encoded with a data structure, computer listing or computer program, having defined structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure, computer listing or computer program and the computer software and hardware component, which permit the data structure's, listing or program's functionality to be realized, is statutory (see MPEP §2106). It is also noted that claimed term "computer data signal" is embodied in a carrier wave.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 4117

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1, 11, 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Malik (U.S. Patent # 7,096,255) (referred to as Malik hereafter).

Regarding claim 1, a method/system for managing interruptions to a network user, the interruptions being generated by a plurality of senders (clients) on a network (column 3 lines 37-40), the network user having a permanent reception list (resource list, column 6 lines 51-55) the method comprising:

modifying (add or remove) a temporary reception list in response to one of a retrospective activity and a prospective activity (event) (column 8 lines 7-9);
receiving an interruption (routing request) from one of the senders on the network (column 7 line 32);

presenting the interruption (routing request) to the network user (client computer of the network user) if one of the permanent reception list and the temporary reception list (resource list, column 7 lines 3-5) includes an entry associated with the one of the senders on the network (column 7 lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 11, this computer program product claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 1 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 13, wherein the program code for modifying a temporary reception list (temporary group, column 7 lines 44-46) further comprises program code for adding (include) an entry (contact alias) to the temporary reception list upon a determination that the time since the occurrence of the retrospective activity is less than a predetermined time (limited period of time) (column 7 lines 46-48).

Regarding claim 27, this apparatus claim comprises limitations(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 1 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable, wherein the method steps further comprise the modules for performing respective function/steps discussed therein, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Art Unit: 4117

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 2-4, 12, 14, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik in view of Hayes et al. (U.S. Patent # 7,139,806) (referred to as Hayes hereafter).

Regarding claim 2, Malik teaches modifying the temporary reception list (temporary group, column 7 lines 44-46) comprises adding an entry (temporary contact) to the temporary reception list (column 7 lines 61-65); however Malik does not teach this modification occurring automatically due to a prospective activity.

Art Unit: 4117

Hayes teaches indicating a priority setting upon a determination the time until the occurrence of the prospective activity is less than a predetermined time (desired contact period) (column 8 lines 14-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given Malik's interest for providing a network user a temporary contact list based on event stimulus and the desire to contact certain users only during limited periods of time, the teaching of Hayes which automatically update contact lists based on the users predetermined times in which the user desires to communicate with the particular contact. One of ordinary skill pertaining instant or real-time messaging would recognize that a predetermined schedule or calendar integrated with the temporary contact list would alleviate the user of the burden to manually add or remove contacts when necessary. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so the convenience of a temporary contact list is enhanced by intelligently revising the list, without the user having to constantly keep track of events and maintaining the changes to the list.

Regarding claim 3, wherein modifying the temporary reception list (Malik: temporary group, column 7 lines 44-46) comprises removing an entry from the temporary reception list (Malik: column 7 lines 41-43) upon a determination that the age of the retrospective activity exceeds a predetermined time (Hayes: linger time, column 18-21).

Art Unit: 4117

Regarding claim 4, wherein the retrospective and prospective activities comprise calendar-based entries (predetermined points in time) established by the user (Hayes: column 8 lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 12, this computer program product claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 2 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 14, this computer program product claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 3 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 28, this apparatus claim comprises limitations(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 2 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable, wherein the method steps further comprise the modules for performing respective function/steps discussed therein, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 29, this apparatus claim comprises limitations(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 3 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable, wherein the method steps further comprise the modules for performing respective function/steps discussed therein, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Art Unit: 4117

7. Claims 5, 15, 19, 20-22, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik in view of Hayes in further view of Brown et al. (Pub No.: US 2003/0055908) (referred to as Brown hereafter).

Regarding claim 5, as set forth above for claim 1, Malik and Hayes disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, Malik and Hayes do not explicitly teach an urgency requirement for received messages.

Brown teaches the step of presenting the interruption further comprises:

receiving an urgency value (priority value) associated with the interruption (message request);

comparing the urgency (priority) value with an interruption threshold value (priority requirement) defined by the network user; and

presenting the interruption (throughput of the message) to the network user (receiving user) if the urgency value exceeds the threshold value (whether the message request meets the priority requirement) (page 4 [0060]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the suggestion of Malik-Hayes for simplifying instant or real-time messaging for a user by allowing contact lists to be easier managed and eliminate cluttering, the teachings of Brown for monitoring the incoming messages to the user. One of ordinary skill would recognize that incorporating a required priority value for

Art Unit: 4117

requests directed to the user, in a messaging system intended to help the user manage contacts, would restrict messages that are not urgent and prevent unnecessary distractions to the user. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so it would offer more preferences to assist a messaging user in managing and controlling their messaging settings by allowing messages from permanent and temporary contacts which may be potentially important.

Regarding claim 15, this computer program product claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 5 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 19, this program code claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 1 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable. Further, limitation(s) include a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave (Brown: [0053]) for use with a computer system having a display (Brown: 24 of FIG. 1) and capable of generating a user interface (communications interface) through which a user may interact with the computer system (network) (Brown: [0053]).

Regarding claim 20, this computer data signal claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 2 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Art Unit: 4117

Regarding claim 21, this computer data signal claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 3 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 22, this computer data signal claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 5 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 30, this apparatus claim comprises limitations(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 5 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable, wherein the method steps further comprise the modules for performing respective function/steps discussed therein, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

8. Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik in view of Kaminsky et al. (Pub. No.: 2005/0055405) (referred to as Kaminsky hereafter).

Regarding claim 7, as set forth above for claim 1, Malik discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Malik does not explicitly teach how a user is notified of an interruption (IM).

Kaminsky teaches presenting the interruption (indicating that IM text is available) comprises presenting an alert (visual display) to the network user if one of the permanent reception list and the temporary reception list (buddy list) includes an entry associated with the one of the senders (Kaminsky: page 3 [0043]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the desirability of Malik to keep a currently updated list of temporary contacts to assist a messaging user in organizing the users contact list and help manage interruptions, the teachings of Kaminsky for controlling the way a user is notified of an incoming interruption. One of ordinary skill would recognize that if a user desired a temporary list of contacts for a specified time period that the user would desire to be alerted when a message is received from one of the contacts on the temporary list, as well as from a permanent contact. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so a user will be aware that a message from a contact with whom the user wishes to communicate with has been received.

Regarding claim 10, comprising providing expanded information (current status) for the one of the senders (someone on his buddy list) to the network user (IM user) in response to a user request (Kaminsky: hover message, page 6 [0069]).

Art Unit: 4117

9. Claims 6, 16 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik in view of Kaminsky in further view of Alexander et al. (US Patent # 6,988,128) (referred to as Alexander hereafter).

Regarding claim 6, Malik does not teach generating a message in response to a user status request based on the sender's reception list status.

Kaminsky teaches generating a generic status message (participants identified in the "customers" category receive an "out of office" icon, page 6 [0068]) if the permanent reception list and the temporary reception list do not include an entry associated with the sender (determined by classification information of the message sender not being in the recipient's buddy list, page 5 [0059]) of the user status request (instant message); and

generating a customized status message ("bio-haard") if one of the permanent reception list and the temporary reception list (buddy list "friends" category) includes an entry associated with the sender of the user status request (instant message) (page 6 [0068]); however although Kaminsky discloses enabling an IM user to display another user's current status (page 6 [0069]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the desirability of Malik to keep a currently updated list of temporary contacts to assist a messaging user in organizing the users contact list and help manage interruptions, the teachings of Kaminsky for controlling the way a user is notified of an incoming interruption. One of ordinary skill would recognize that if a user

desired a temporary list of contacts for a specified time period that the user would desire to be alerted when a message is received from one of the contacts on the temporary list, as well as from a permanent contact. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so a user will be aware that a message from a contact with whom the user wishes to communicate with has been received. However, Malik-Kaminsky does not explicitly teach receiving a user status request from one of the senders.

Alexander teaches receiving a user status request (detecting an incoming request for instant messaging status for the user) from one of the senders (column 3 lines 60-62);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the teachings of Malik-Kaminsky for generating a general away message for certain requestors and a personalized away message for other requestors, depending on their status on the users contact list, the teaching of Alexander for generating an automatic message in response to a request for the users status. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so it allows a user's preferences regarding how they wish sending users to be informed of their user status to be utilized in a messaging system that has the additional feature of user status requests, in addition to away messages in response to an incoming message.

Regarding claim 16, this computer program product claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 6 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 31, this apparatus claim comprises limitations(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 6 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable, wherein the method steps further comprise the modules for performing respective function/steps discussed therein, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

9. Claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik in view of Kaminsky in further view of Daniell et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0068545) (referred to as Daniell hereafter).

Regarding claim 8, Kaminsky teaches that the alert comprises a signal that an interruption has been requested, and an identification of the at least one of the senders (indication of the message sender) is stored in a table (distinct folder) for inspection by the user (page 3 [0042]); however, Kaminsky does not explicitly disclose the alert including a portion of the message.

Daniell teaches a portion of an initial message from one of the senders (received message) to be previewed by a user (page 5 [0059]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the teachings to Malik-Kaminsky to reduce the distraction of incoming messages to a user and reducing clutter on the display by initially only alerting the user of a received request with information regarding the sender, the teaching of Daniell for having a preview of an electronic message prior to the message being opened by the user. One would be motived to combine these teachings because in doing so the information regarding the content of a request available to the user is increased, resulting in the user being able to make more informed decisions as to which messages the user wishes to expand at a particular time.

Regarding claim 9, wherein the alert comprises at least one of a portion of an initial message from the one of the senders (Daniell: received message, page 5 [0059]) and an identification of the one of the senders (Kaminsky: indication of the message sender, page 3 [0042]).

Regarding claim 17, this computer program product claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claims 7 and 9 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 18, this computer program product claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 10 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 32, this apparatus claim comprises limitations(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 7 and 9 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable, wherein the method steps further comprise the modules for performing respective function/steps discussed therein, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 33, this apparatus claim comprises limitations(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 10 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable, wherein the method steps further comprise the modules for performing respective function/steps discussed therein, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

10. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik-Hayes-Brown in view of Kaminsky in further view of Alexander.

Regarding claim 23, Malik-Hayes-Brown do not teach generating a message in response to a user status request based on the sender's reception list status.

Kaminsky teaches program code (software embodiment, [0072]) for generating a generic status message (participants identified in the "customers" category receive an "out of office" icon, page 6 [0068]) if the permanent reception list and the temporary reception list do not include an entry associated with the sender (determined by classification information of the message sender not being in the recipient's buddy list, page 5 [0059]) of the user status request (instant message); and

program code for generating a customized status message ("bio-haard") if one of the temporary reception list and the permanent reception list (buddy list "friends" category) includes an entry associated with the sender of the user status request (instant message) (page 6 [0068]); however although Kaminsky discloses enabling an IM user to display another user's current status (page 6 [0069])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the suggestion of Malik-Hayes-Brown for simplifying real-time messaging for a user by allowing contact lists to be easier managed and eliminate cluttering further by monitoring incoming messages, the teachings of Kaminsky for controlling the way a user is notified of incoming messages. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so it would offer more preference options to assist a messaging user in managing their personal settings. However, Malik-Hayes-Brown-Kaminsky does not explicitly teach receiving a user status request from one of the senders.

Alexander teaches receiving a user status request (detecting in incoming request for instant messaging status for the user) from one of the senders (column 3 lines 60-62);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the suggestion of Malik-Hayes-Brown for simplifying real-time messaging for a user by allowing contact lists to be easier managed and eliminate cluttering further by monitoring incoming messages, the teachings of Alexander for generating an automatic message in response to a request for the users status. One

would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so cluttering would be further reduced by giving the user the option to notify other users of their status without having to be interrupted by an incoming message.

11. Claim 24 and 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik-Hayes-Brown in view of Kaminsky in further view of Daniell.

Regarding claim 24, Malik-Hayes-Brown do not teach the alert and information a network user receives when a message associated with a sender on the users contact list is presented.

Kaminsky teaches program code (software embodiment, [0072]) for presenting the interruption (indicating that IM text is available) comprises program code for presenting an alert (visual display) to the network user if one of the temporary reception list and the permanent reception list (buddy list) includes an entry associated with the one of the senders (Kaminsky: page 3 [0043]), the alert comprising an identification of the one of the senders (Kaminsky: indication of the message sender, page 3 [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the suggestion of Malik-Hayes-Brown for simplifying real-time messaging for a user by allowing contact lists to be easier managed and eliminate cluttering further by monitoring incoming messages, the teachings of Kaminsky for controlling the way a user is notified of incoming messages. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so it would offer more preferences options to

assist a messaging user in managing their personal settings. However, Malik-Hayas-Brown-Kaminsky does not explicitly teach the alert comprising a portion of the initial message.

Daniell teaches the alert comprises at least one of a portion of an initial message from the senders (Daniell: received message, page 5 [0059]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the suggestion of Malik-Hayes-Brown for simplifying real-time messaging for a user by allowing contact lists to be easier managed and eliminate cluttering further by monitoring incoming messages, the teachings of Daniell for having a preview of an electronic message prior to the message being opened by the user. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so the messaging user would be able to make a more informed decision as to which messages the user wishes to open and which messages the user wishes to ignore, resulting in improved monitoring and managing of incoming messages.

Regarding claim 25, Kaminsky teaches program code (software embodiment, [0072]) for providing expanded information (current status) about the sender (someone on his buddy list) to the network user (IM user) in response to a user request (hover message) (page 6 [0069]).

12. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik in view of Brown.

Regarding claim 26, Malik teaches a computing system comprising:

each interruption is presented to the network user if one of a permanent reception list and a temporary reception list (Malik: resource list, column 7 lines 3-5) includes an entry associated with the respective sender (Malik: column 7 lines 32-35); however, Malik does not explicitly disclose the components of the system.

Brown teaches:

a display screen (Brown: 24 of FIG. 1);
a user input device (Brown: eg. keyboard, 26 of FIG. 1); and
a processor (Brown: 12 of FIG. 1) executing a network user communications program (application software) to manage (carry out) interruptions (Brown: depicted in FIGS. 16, 17) to a network user (Brown: page 3 [0051]), the interruptions being generated by a plurality of senders on a network (Brown: 40a-40n of FIG. 2), wherein each interruption is presented to the network user on the display screen (Brown: GUI, page 3 [0051]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given Malik's interest for providing a network user a temporary contact list based on event stimulus and the desire to contact certain users only during limited periods of time, the teaching of Brown for controlling throughput of message requests in a messaging system. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so administration of a user's messaging system would be further managed by monitoring the contact list of contacts which the user wishes to communicate with as

well as selectively restricting the incoming requests which could potentially cause unnecessary distractions.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Madhu Khanna whose telephone number is 571-270-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beatriz Prieto can be reached on 571-272-3902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



BEATRIZ PRIETO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE